



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/610,504	06/30/2003	Jonathan E. Rivers-Moore	MSI-1408US	9202
22801	7590	03/09/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			COBY, FRANTZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/610,504	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RIVERS-MOORE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Frantz Coby	<b>Art Unit</b> 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-29-03;08-26-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

This is in response to Application filed on June 30, 2003 in which claims 1-81 are presented for examination.

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-81 are pending.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed on February 03, 2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3, 27-28 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "a special name that can be computed" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what a "special name" constitutes of or what is required for a name to be special. Also, the claimed language "that can be

Art Unit: 2161

computed" is indefinite because there will be time when "a special name" might not be computed. Therefore, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite. Further, the phrase "the solution can be discovered" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what the result will be when a solution cannot be discovered. Therefore, because of this uncertainty, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite.

Regarding claim 2, the phrase "the data file can be discovered" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what the result will be when data file cannot be discovered and deployed. Therefore, because of this uncertainty, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite.

Regarding claim 3, the phrases "data can be received" and "data file can be viewed" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what the result will be when data file cannot be received or "data file cannot be viewed". Therefore, because of this uncertainty, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite.

Regarding claim 27, the phrase "a manifest of all files that can be used" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what the result will be when the manifest of the file cannot be used. Therefore, because of this uncertainty, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite.

Regarding claim 28, the phrase "a special name that can be computed" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what a "special name" constitutes or what is required for a name to be special. Also, the claimed language "that can be computed" is indefinite because there will be time when "a special name" might not be computed. Therefore, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite. Therefore, because of this uncertainty, the aforementioned claimed feature renders the claim vague and indefinite.

Regarding claim 48, the phrase "a special name" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what a "special name" constitutes or what is required for a name to be special. Thus, this uncertainty renders claim 48 vague and indefinite.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hawley et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,192,367.

As per claim 1, Hawley et al. disclose "a solution for a data file, the data file having a hierarchical arrangement of a plurality of nodes, each said node each having a

structure” (See Hawley et al. Col. 5, lines 29-64), and wherein the solution comprises: a special name that can be computed from a solution identifier in the data file, wherein the solution can be discovered for deployment by using the special name when executed in conjunction with an opening of the data file” (See Hawley et al. Figure 3; Col. 4, lines 29-50). Hawley et al. disclose the claimed features of “a presentation application which, when executed in conjunction with the opening of the data file, displays data in the data file in a plurality of data-entry fields in an electronic form, wherein the plurality of data-entry fields of the electronic form are mapped to a corresponding plurality of the nodes of the data file” (See Hawley et al. Figure 4; Col. 4, line 51-Col. 6, line 5; Col. 2, lines 9-26; Col. 1, lines 47-64).

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Hawley et al. disclose the claimed feature “wherein the solution for the data file can be discovered and deployed without user interaction by an electronic forms application executing on a computer that is configured to discover and deploy the solution of the data file” as described in the specification Page 9, paragraph 0027 “a solution file contains presentation and logic applications. The presentation and logic applications of a solution file declaratively define aspects a data file such as its elements, attributes, and values. The elements, attributes, and values that are declaratively defined can include a schema for the data file, one or more views that can be used for viewing and entering data in the data file”. Hawley et al. disclose data files

having elements, attributes, and values that are used as file structure information to open a file without user interaction (See Hawley et al. Col. 4, lines 29-51). Therefore, the claimed feature of "the solution for the data file can be discovered and deployed without user interaction by an electronic forms application executing on a computer that is configured to discover and deploy the solution of the data file" is clearly met by Hawley et al.

As per claim 27, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Hawley et al. disclose the claimed feature of "a manifest of all files" as a display that reveals all the files (See Hawley et al. Figures 6 and 8; Col. 6, line 49-Col. 7, line 67; Col. 8, line 25-Col. 9, line 4); "representing the data file in the electronic form" (See Hawley Figures 3-6 and 8 and corresponding text); "allowing a user in input data into the data-entry fields" and "validating the data that the user inputs into the data-entry fields" through a user interface which accepts inputs and commands (See Hawley et al. Figure 1; Col. 2, line 65-Col. 3, line 45). Note that, Hawley et al. provides an apparatus comprises a window displayable on the monitor and the window comprising a view of the data fields, the view indicating editable data fields with an indication derived from the data structure information (See Hawley et al. Col. 2, lines 14-17). The indication derives from the data structure information is part of the methodology in Hawley to validate input data.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3, 4-26, 28-81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,192,367 in view of Prichard US 2003/0025732 A1

As per claims 3, 29, 39, 42, 48, 76 and 79 most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-2 and 27. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1-2 and 27 above.

It is noted, however, although Hawley et al. did disclose a solution for a data file; he did not specifically detail a solution for a structured markup-language document. On the other hand, Prichard achieved the claimed feature of a solution for a structured



markup language document by providing a system and a method for providing customized graphical user interfaces and/or screen layouts in a computer system. In accordance with the preferred embodiment, a web browser is nested in an application and used to convert internally generated HTML text files into displayed graphical user interfaces. Aspects of the application user interface are defined in one or more XML text files, which are primarily data files, although they contain what may be considered source code. To define a user interface, the XML text file(s) contain a sufficient definition of the data format, relative location on the screen, presentation format, and application data identifier(s) for each display field. For example, each file could define a dialog box or a tab in a dialog box. In accordance with the preferred embodiment, the user selects a user interface, which the application software uses to select a user interface definition file. The application loads the selected user interface definition file (a text file in XML format) and populates it with the current application data. Then the application opens a dialog and in the dialog opens a web browser. The dialog selects the general layout by selecting an HTML general layout text file from the user interface definition files. The retrieved XML and HTML text files are templates, which need to be filled in. The in-memory representation of these files is accomplished using software that supports the DOM interface. One portion of the user interface generation software populates the XML file with the current application data using a DOM. Another portion of the user interface generation software, i.e., scripting software, converts the populated XML DOM to HTML and then uses the resulting HTML text to fill in the selected HTML template. The end result is an HTML-based graphical user interface in the web browser.

In accordance with the preferred embodiment of the invention, the user can edit the current application data by interacting with the graphical user interface, invoking DHTML events that are handled by scripting software. This provides a dynamic editing environment in which the user can edit freely (See Prichard Page 1, Sections 0016-0019).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data file editor of Hawley et al. by incorporating the structured markup languages methodologies of Prichard. The advantages are; the addition of new general user interface layout files to the system adds new general user interface layouts to the application. The addition of display/edit definition files to the system adds new displays/editors to the application. Customization is achieved simply by editing user interface definition files (display/edit or general layout). The use of HTML leverages a browser's capability to dynamically layout the display based on the general layout, the fields to display, and even the language translated text. The use of web technologies enables the display of the user interface locally and on a remote computer. Lastly, the use of web technologies such as DHTML, XML, XSL, and scripting leverages a browser's capability to provide an interactive user interface.

As per claims 4-26, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-3 and 27. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1-2 and 27 above. In addition, as to the aspects of validating data that the user inputs into a data entry field, Hawley et al. provides an apparatus comprises a window

Art Unit: 2161

displayable on the monitor and the window comprising a view of the data fields, the view indicating editable data fields with an indication derived from the data structure information (See Hawley et al. Col. 2, lines 14-17). The indication derived from the data structure information is part of the methodology in Hawley to validate input data.

As per claims 28, 30-38, 40-41, 43-47, 49-75, 77-78 and 80-81 most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-26, 27, 29, 39, 42, 48, 76 and 79. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-26, 27, 29, 39, 42, 48, 76 and 79 above. In addition, Prichard discloses the claimed limitations of "wherein the data file is written in XML and includes a solution identifier; the presentation application is written in XSLT; the electronic form is written in XHTML; a special name can be computed from a solution identifier in the data file; and the solution can be discovered for deployment by using the special name when executed in conjunction with the opening of the data file" (See Prichard Pages 2-4).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 571 272 4017. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Saturday 3:00PM-10:30PM.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571 272 4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**FRANTZ COBY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

March 2, 2006